

**Nevada Department of Education
Teachers and Leaders Council
Wednesday, May 20, 2015 - 9:00 A.M.**

Meeting Locations

NV Dept. of Education
700 E. Fifth Street
Board Room
Carson City, NV 89701

and

NV Dept. of Education
9890 S. Maryland Parkway
2nd Floor, Board Room
Las Vegas, NV 89183

and

Great Basin College
1500 College Parkway
High Tech Center, RM 137
Elko, NV 89801

PUBLIC NOTICE

The public is hereby noticed that the Nevada Department of Education/Teachers and Leaders Council reserves the right to take agenda items out of posted order (except that public hearings will not begin earlier than posted times). Items may be pulled or removed from the agenda at any time and items may be combined for consideration. A time for public comment is provided at the beginning and at the conclusion of the meeting. A time limit of three minutes will be imposed by the Council Chair for public comments, in order to afford all members of the public who wish to comment with an opportunity to do so within the timeframe available to the Council. The Council Chair reserves the right to call on individuals from the audience or to allow for testimony at any time. Individuals providing testimony must complete a visitor card.

Reasonable efforts will be made for members of the public who have disabilities and require special accommodations or assistance at the meeting. Please call the Council assistant at (702) 668-4308, at least five business days in advance so that arrangements can be made.

This public notice has been posted at the offices of the Department of Education (NDE) in Carson City and Las Vegas, at the 17 Nevada County School District Superintendents' Offices, at the 17 County Public Libraries, and at the Nevada State Library and Archives. Notice of this meeting was posted on the Internet through the Nevada Department of Education website at www.nde.doe.nv.gov.

The support materials to this agenda are available next to the meeting date referenced above, at no charge on the NDE website at: http://www.doe.nv.gov/Boards_Commissions_Councils/Teachers_and_Leaders_Council/. You may also contact Laurie Hamilton at the Department of Education Office at 9890 South Maryland Parkway, Las Vegas, NV 89183

MINUTES

1. Call to Order; Pledge of Allegiance, Roll Call

Dr. Pamela Salazar, Chair

9:07 a.m. Chair Salazar called meeting to order. Pledge of Allegiance recited. Roll call completed with attendance as indicated. Eleven (11) members were present constituting a quorum (nine required.)

Council Members Present

Pamela Salazar, Chair
Barbara Barker, Vice Chair
Veronica Frenkel (left 12:54 pm)
Vida Bierria
Dena Durish
Dottie Smith

Gabe Gonzalez
Kim Metcalf
Dale Norton
Jessie Phee
Theo Small

Absent Council Members

Theresa Crowley
Jason Sanderson

Amy Henderson
Terri Janison

NDE Staff Present

Kathleen Galland-Collins, Education Programs Professional
Leslie James, Education Programs Professional
Richard Vineyard, Education Programs Supervisor
Laurie Hamilton, Assistant to Council

Legal Council

Greg Ott, Deputy Attorney General (DAG)

Public in Attendance

Karen Stanley, RPDP
Andrea Klafter-Rakita, CCSD
R. Kaufman, NSC

Bart Mangino, RPDP
Sue DeFrancesco, RPDP
A. Long, CCSD

Sylvia Tegano, RPDP
Chelli Smith, SNRPDP
Patrick Rossi, WEA
J.T. Stark, WCSD
Dawn Huckaby, WCSD
Kirsten Gleissner, NWRPDP
Holly Mercer, WCSD

Marjorie Conner, RPDP
Linda Hunt, NSEA/WEA
Dana Galvin, Washoe Ed Assoc. President
Mike McLamore, NSEA
Jose Delfin, Carson City, SD
Sarah Negrete, NNRPDP
Stephen Augspurger, CCASA

2. Public Comment #1

Public Comment will be taken during this agenda item regarding any item appearing on the agenda. No action may be taken on a matter discussed under this item until the matter is included on an agenda as an item on which action may be taken. The Chair of the Teachers and Leaders Council will impose a time limit of three minutes. Public Comment #2 will provide an opportunity for public comment on any matter within the Teachers and Leaders Council jurisdiction, control or advisory power.

Chair Salazar – Called for public comment from Carson City, Elko, and Las Vegas. There was no public comment from any of the regions.

3. Approval of Flexible Agenda

(For Possible Action) Dr. Pamela Salazar, Chair

Chair Salazar – Called for a motion to approve a flexible agenda.

Member Norton – Motioned for approval of a flexible agenda.

Member Small – Seconded the motion.

Chair Salazar –Motion carried unanimously. Chair stated that she will move Agenda Item #6 after Item #10. She further asked for consideration to move additional items if necessary.

4. Approval of Prior Meeting Minutes

(Information/Discussion/For Possible Action) Dr. Pamela Salazar, Chair

- a. January 21, 2015
- b. February 18, 2015
- c. March 25, 2015

Chair Salazar – Asked members to read minutes from February 18, 2015. She added that the minutes were still being completed from the meetings of January and March 2015. They will be presented for a vote at a future meeting.

Member Small - Motioned to approve the February 18th minutes as written.

Member Norton – Seconded the motion

Chair Salazar – Asked for discussion. Hearing none, she called for the vote. The motion carried unanimously.

5. Department of Education Updates

(Information/Discussion) Dena Durish, Director, NDE Division of Educator Effectiveness and Family Engagement

Member Durish – Reminded members who received a notice from the Governor’s office of their TLC membership expiration, to take appropriate action as required if interested in serving another term. She proceeded to provide a detailed review of recent legislative updates in regard to education initiatives. She also discussed specific and detailed information about AB447 and the recommendations that TLC made to the bill.

- NEPF additional funding has not yet been appropriated regarding the technology platform or training.
- The principal supervisor piece that was recommended by TLC was included in the bill.

- The Board was given the ability to determine which of the Group 3 OLEPs may be considered as part of the statewide system of evaluation, which OLEPs might continue to have their own individual district-based assessments, and if any, what student achievement would be used to measure that.
- All student achievement measures have been delayed for 2015-2016 school year. For 2016-2017 there will be 20%; 10% of which is standardized assessment achievement scores and 10% district-level assessments. During the 2017-2018 school year the percent goes up to 40%; 20% of which are state assessment results and 20% the local configuration of assessment data.

Member Durish restated the TLC members' responsibility to come to consensus as to their recommendations during this meeting and in the upcoming June meeting to bring to the State Board on September 3, 2015.

Member Metcalf – Asked Chair Salazar to restate the above ideas for his notes.

Chair Salazar – Provided a detailed review and reasoning behind the decisions noted above. She asked for additional clarifying questions.

Members asked questions about weighting over the years and to whom the student-outcome piece applies.

Member Durish – Continued her update.

- She reviewed the remaining recommendation in regard to the NEPF observations and evaluations. When everything is finalized, NDE will publish the information for the TLC members and the field.
- Additionally, Washoe County School District requested use of a different evaluation system. The law was amended to give the authority to the State Board to approve these district requests. The legislators wanted the Board to review the alignment of proposed systems; and that any alternate evaluation systems still include the Standards and Indicators of the NEPF, but the Board will have that discretion. Unless there is a program or system that is approved by the Board prior to the 2015-2016 school year, all districts will be using the NEPF Standards and Indicators for Educational Practice for Teachers and Site-based Administrators.
- There were a couple of bills in front of the legislature that have differing language. Should both bills pass, there is a mechanism within the legislature to resolve any conflicting issues. It is important that TLC members know that the NDE is addressing these issues within the legislative framework. Chair Salazar also has a meeting with the Lieutenant Governor and bill sponsors to make TLC recommendations and positions clear.

Member Metcalf – Offered that it is important that he state for the record that TLC continues to remind our legislators of the paradox between an evaluation system that may be viewed as an attempt to eliminate ineffective educators from the profession, which is a noble and worthy goal; at a time when we have a statewide shortage of 3,000 teachers, even before the Governor's new initiatives that will increase the need we have for qualified educators.

Member Small – Brought forward a question in regard to probationary teachers, an unsatisfactory evaluation and the effect it would have on their teaching status.

Member Durish – Offered that this was not an item that was on the agenda and is not within the context of the meeting. She said she would check with legal about these issues. NDE is aware that there is clarifying language that needs to be done around this, which would be a good time to address the concerns Theo is raising.

Chair Salazar – Proceeded to Agenda Item #7.

6. TLC Recommendations to State Board of Education

(Information/Discussion/For Possible Action) Dr. Pamela Salazar, Chair

Review TLC recommendations / presentation to State Board of Education and outcomes of April 30, 2015, State Board Meeting.

- Peer Evaluation System
- Aligned Evaluation Model for "Other Licensed Educational Personnel" (OLEP)

Chair Salazar – Stated that she presented to the State Board of Education all of the recommendations captured in the minutes of the TLC meeting of February 18, 2015. Additionally, she discussed the recommendations about the Peer Evaluation System and the description and recommendations of the OLEP, which were very well received. There was a request from the Board for additional information in regard to peer evaluation. We have that information and will consult with the American Institutes of Research (AIR.) Chair Salazar then moved to Agenda Item #13.

7. 2014 – 2015 Validation Study

(Information/Discussion/For Possible Action) Sujie Shin, Sr. Research Associate, WestEd

Present preliminary findings from year two of the Validation Study.

Sujie Shin – Directed members to her PowerPoint presentation in regard to the preliminary findings from the Validation Study. The presentation was posted and accessible on the TLC website. She stated that it was her intention to cover 1) data collection activities; 2) preliminary results by activities; 3) implications from the field on issues of validity, reliability, fairness, feasibility, and ultimately defensibility. She reminded the audience of the mission of the study, which was to establish a research basis to the best extent possible to gather as much information to support implementation moving forward.

Members asked questions and engaged in discussions in regard to data interpretation, collection, what may be available in the future, application, administration, and the effect of the data on program implementation.

Ms. Shin - Concluded her presentation with three main points.

- 1) Training was critical. It increased understanding of framework, standards and indicators, and the process itself. It improved the perception of readiness and produced strong agreement among evaluators as to how to use the rubric.
- 2) Schools and districts wanted additional support. They wanted clarification on student growth on rubric scoring and structural issues. They asked for access to on-line scoring tools and additional training across all domains.
- 3) Educators expressed their readiness to get started.

Members asked questions and commented in relation to data discrepancies in the findings among districts and student ability and student data based upon that ability.

Member Small - Addressed the idea that there appeared to be a perception among administrators that the teacher's union requires a three. Member Small wanted it entered into the record that the teacher's union wanted more representations of an evaluation that actually impacts and grows teachers and administrators.

Chair Salazar – Asked for additional questions and comments. She moved the discussion to Agenda Item #10, in regard to Scoring and the Educational Practice Category.

8. Other Licensed Educational Personnel (OLEP) / Group 3

(Information/Discussion/For Possible Action) Kathleen Galland-Collins, NDE Education Programs Professional

Review most recent stakeholder group meetings.

Kathleen Galland-Collins – Directed members and audience to her presentation materials, which were posted and accessible on the TLC website. She reviewed the updates, revisions, and additional information relating to Specialized Educational Professionals. She indicated that the information reflected the work that had been done with stakeholder groups during work sessions. The School Social Workers are the only OLEP stakeholder group remaining for which work sessions need to be completed.

Chair Salazar – Solicited any questions or comments in regard to OLEP Group 3. Hearing none, she directed the discussion to Agenda Item #9.

9. TLC Remaining Recommendations per NRS 391.460 and 391.465

(Information/Discussion/For Possible Action) Dena Durish, Director, NDE Division of Educator Effectiveness and Family Engagement; Kathleen Galland-Collins, NDE Education Programs Professional

- a. NEPF Monitoring Timeline
- b. Educational Practice Category Final Scoring

Kathleen Galland-Collins – Pointed members to the handout entitled “TLC Required Recommendations Status Update May 20, 2015.” This handout was posted and accessible on the TLC website. She stated that the statutes in this document were paraphrased. She added that the items listed represented the items that the TLC still needs to complete to meet statutory requirements. She concluded that until the legislative session ends, most of the TLC work has been completed.

Chair Salazar – Moved to Agenda Item #11, RPDP reports.

10. Scoring of NEPF Educational Practice Category

(Information/Discussion/For Possible Action) Sujie Shin, Sr. Research Associate, WestEd

Propose and review possible scoring options for determining Educational Practice portion of the final NEPF rating.

Chair Salazar – Provided an introduction of Agenda Item #10 with a review of prior discussions about scoring, developing ranges, determination of scores to define highly effective, effective, minimally effective, and ineffective ratings; and the current percentages in reference to Instructional Practice and Professional Responsibilities. She explained that during these previous processes some business rules had been established; such as to weight standards the same as others and to scale everything up so that when a final score was reached it was somewhere between zero and four. Now the range of scores that determines each of four levels of evaluation needs to be agreed upon. Chair Salazar added that the intent in the discussion at this meeting was to provide information. TLC will then come to a final agreement during the June meeting to inform what happens during the 2015-2016 school year.

Sujie Shin – Stated that this was a “thinking through” exercise and there were no recommendations to put forth in terms of best practice or what data told us. The discussion centered on what some of the implications were on the decisions the TLC may make. She directed members to their handouts which were posted and accessible on the TLC website. She stated that the focus of this presentation was on the overall Educational Practice piece. This included the Professional Responsibilities and the Student Performance sections that had a significant weight on the overall scoring. She continued to review the handout and PowerPoint slides. Ms. Shin then set guidelines to frame the upcoming cut score discussion.

- 1) Pedagogy Model – Determine what you think a highly effective teacher should be able to do, and so on for each level. Draw the line before looking at the distribution. She provided the example that to be rated highly effective, a teacher should have fours in specific rubric categories, threes in these categories, etc.; thereby establishing the scoring range for each level of teacher.
- 2) Impact “X” Percent of Teachers – Identify a specific proportion of teachers to either remediate, for a particular type of professional development, for additional merit pay or career opportunities beyond the classroom, etc.
- 3) Combination of Methods #1 and #2 – Allows for more flexibility and takes into consideration pedagogical and human capital decision making.

Ms. Shin recommended opening the floor to members for discussion of what the Nevada priorities are for stakeholders, where will they be in 2015-2016 and 2016-2017, the decision-making about the student outcomes and the changes to the weightings, and distributions after identifying local and state measures that could change emphasis.

Member discussion and questions included concern over evaluation scores not being what were expected; the norms of the cut scores across evaluation levels; how the score distribution will look for administrators; by statute a minimally effective evaluation results in reversion to probationary status; if the scores between levels were not diverse enough, evaluations may be written to a level for convenience and the rating will not accurately reflect performance; in thinking of the system as a growth opportunity, it is not necessarily a bad thing to be placed on probation, receive extra observations and input, and could be positive; balance fairness in the system; collect data from year to year as a benchmark of the system efficacy; current statute in reference to having two consecutive years of unsatisfactory evaluations to be moved back to probationary status and did that statute change to one year; this scoring system will start at a place that can be changed and

it is not set in stone; and this is most likely a longer work session discussion for either a smaller group or the whole group.

Chair Salazar – Asked members if there were any further questions or comments. She then asked Ms. Shin if it would be feasible for WestEd (Sujie) to assist the Council to delve into these numbers in a closer way. Chair Salazar also offered several areas for consideration moving forward, such as how were the numbers arrived at for the samples; to analyze the data from the collective group; was there a different distribution as compared to the whole distribution; and looking at the subgroups may provide a distribution to be examined, since there were different levels of training.

Sujie Shin – Offered her observations about the implementation process when a new evaluation system is undertaken. She described rating levels, importance of language and meaning of words ascribed to levels such as “does not happen /happened once /happening /adequately – sufficiently /effectively –exemplary,” as these words narrow the scope of each level. These defining words also assist in moving between levels with more ease. She recommended that the TLC, in thinking about standards revisions, might want to bring in teacher and administrator focus groups to talk through what some of their weighting meant and why.

Chair Salazar – Said that one of the things learned this year as trainers, was that the piece that was missing was the last sheet in the rubric that describes the differences between the four levels. There was still misunderstanding of the four levels and people were not aware of the resources there. She added that there are still many facets involved in making this a fair and accurate system. Chair Salazar voiced additional concerns about training. This year the RPDs were specifically directed to 146 validation schools for training. Next year the system will be rolled out to 734 schools without the benefit of the training. This could make implementation among non-validation schools difficult. Survey results show that validation schools were concerned for the non-validation schools because they have not had access to the training information and were not expected to for the most part. She added that TLC must consider this in their decision-making. She then asked for any additional comments.

Member Phee – Expressed her concern over the time factor involved in implementation. If an evaluator is going to issue ratings of 1s and 2s, it takes a lot of time and evidence must be collected to support that rating. You must be in that classroom a lot. If you have not had the opportunity to truly observe, give feedback, and give them the opportunity to grow, in fairness you are not going to give 1 and 2 ratings. It is especially difficult if you have a high number of probationary teachers. The score distribution does not surprise her because of the conversations out there. This being a new system, you may not be sure if you read the standards correctly and are applying the evidence to the appropriate standard. This is a completely different shift as to instructional leadership in the past. More and more is being added to our plates without anything being removed. There is a big impact on time.

Chair Salazar – Asked members if a couple of people are willing to work with Sujie on the evaluation numbers in a virtual meeting environment. She asked DAG Ott as to how this work can be conducted.

DAG Ott – Responded that to the extent you would be delegating to a sub-group or members of the Council the ability to gather information and make recommendations to the Council, that constitutes a sub-committee that is held to Open Meeting Law requirements and the guidelines of the TLC.

Chair Salazar – Reiterated that there are two ways to move forward with the scoring issue and asked the Council how they wanted to work through this. She added that this had to be ready to take action in June.

- 1) A sub-committee can be formed in compliance with applicable laws.
- 2) Chair Salazar can work directly with Sujie and bring the information back to the Council to then conduct discussions and take action on an agenda item.

Member Norton – Made a motion that Chair Salazar be given the authority to work with Sujie in relation to gathering the rating / scoring information for the June meeting.

Member Phee – Seconded the motion.

Chair Salazar – Stated that there was a motion on the floor enabling her to work with Sujie on the Council’s behalf to gather the rating / scoring information to bring back to the Council’s June meeting. She asked DAG

Ott if the information gathered during proposed meeting between she and Sujie could be posted on the website for review only by TLC members and the public prior to the June meeting.

DAG Ott – Responded that it would be acceptable to post just the information for review. As long as there was nothing that could be considered discussion, deliberation, recommendations, and no consensus was formed outside of a public meeting, providing facts is acceptable.

Chair Salazar – Asked the members if there was any further discussion. Hearing none, she called for the vote on the motion on the floor. Motion carried unanimously. She verified that quorum was still present and action could still be taken or voted upon for another twenty (20) minutes. Chair Salazar moved the discussion to Agenda Item #8 Group 3 and then to Agenda Item #9.

11. Curriculum and Instruction Recommended by TLC and Statewide Training for Teachers and Administrators Pursuant to NRS 319.544

(Information/Discussion/For Possible Action) Dr. Pamela Salazar, Chair; Dr. Sarah Negrete, Director, Northern Nevada RPDP; Kirsten Gleissner, Director, Northwestern RPDP; Bill Hanlon, Director, Southern RPDP

Chair Salazar – Called for a report from Sarah Negrete from the NNRPDP or Kirsten Gleissner from the NWRPDP. Neither representative was still in attendance in Carson City. Chair Salazar then called on Karen Stanley, representing the SNRPDP on behalf of Bill Hanlon.

Karen Stanley – Reviewed the SNRPDP mission in closing out the validation schools, as well as their charge moving ahead through June 2015, and the ongoing training for next school year. They had a 98% attendance rate for their Inter-Rater Reliability (IRR) Training. The feedback received from participants was consistent with the preliminary report. Participants asked for more training and collaboration to ensure IRR. Ms. Stanley offered that there has been a lot of conversation with non-validation schools. In looking forward to implementing with all NV schools, they are considering what IRR training looks like for the remaining schools. Beginning in May, SNRPDP began conducting IRR training with non-validation schools. These classes were full. Their SNRPDP Institute on June 15th, is adding the opportunity for over 200 administrators to participate in Round 1 of IRR training. They are also considering Round 2 training moving forward. RPDP will also sponsor another round with Dr. Heritage. They have realized the need for intense collaboration on their part as professional development providers and that they also need training on NEPF, as they are not the experts to date. In reviewing the funding sources, RPDP will be applying for the Great Teaching and Leading Funds (GTLF) grants, as there was not any additional funding for the NEPF training to further identify what the next step requires as they go deeper into the teacher training and leadership standards. This is particularly true in relation to the Professional Responsibility Standards. Additional focus will be devoted to the NV Academic Content Standards and how those standards are aligned with the NEPF. This is the type of training the RPDP would like to offer based on their GTLF application and the acceptance of grant funding.

Chair Salazar – Asked for any questions from TLC members for Ms. Stanley. Hearing none, she moved to Agenda Item #6.

12. National Issues and Legal Landscape of Educator Evaluation Updates

(Information/Discussion) Dr. Pamela Salazar, Chair

Chair Salazar – Recommended that Agenda Item #12 be postponed because there hasn't been much change since the previous TLC meeting. She anticipated having more information at the next meeting with regard to the reauthorization of No Child Left Behind. She then moved the discussion to Agenda Item #14.

13. 2015-2016 Proposed Meeting Schedule

(Information/Discussion/For Possible Action) Dr. Pamela Salazar, Chair

Chair Salazar – Asked that the dates for the upcoming TLC meeting year be read. She stated that the meeting dates will be sent to the members and posted on the TLC website immediately following the meeting. See Agenda Item #12.

14. Future Agenda Items

(Information/Discussion) Dr. Pamela Salazar, Chair

Chair Salazar – Stated that the bulk of the June meeting will be spent on designing the scoring and reviewing the implications of the final days of the legislative session and planning for next year to comply with what comes from this session. She asked for any recommendations from members as to future agenda items.

Member Durish - Recommended that further discussion of Group 3 recommendations made to the Board be held sooner rather than later.

Chair Salazar – Asked for additional recommendations from members. Hearing none, she moved to Agenda Item #15.

15. Public Comment #2

Public comment will be taken during this agenda item on any matter within the Teachers and Leaders Council jurisdiction, control, or advisory power. No action may be taken on a matter raised under this item until the matter is included on an agenda as an item on which action may be taken. The Teachers and Leaders Council Chair will impose a time limit of three minutes.

Chair Salazar – Called for public comment from the Carson City, Elko, and Las Vegas. There was no public comment from any region. She then asked for any closing comments from members.

Member Norton – Stated that he appreciated everything that the RPDs were doing; and, that there is a cost associated with it. We are so geared into evaluation, and the dollars are not coming to supplant the professional development to help facilitate the needs of teachers who need assistance. In the long haul we need to figure out what needs to be done to get back to teacher training and development from zero to four. The other part is that when we are competitively going after the same competitive grant money, someone is going to be a loser.

Member Small – Offered that as we look forward to the passing of AB447, especially if TLC ends up with the responsibility for recommending evaluation of supervisors of principals, he wondered if the TLC needs to be expanded to include more than one person who supervises principals.

Chair Salazar – Responded to Member Small's statement with additional potential resources that may be accessed to provide input on developing expectations and standards for supervisors of principals. She solicited any further member remarks. No additional comments were offered.

16. Adjournment

Chair Salazar – Adjourned the meeting at 1:24 pm.